



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/806,651	05/29/2001	Hiroyuki Uenaka	MTS-3251US	3316

7590 06/13/2006

Allan Ratner  
Ratner & Prestia  
PO Box 980  
Valley Forge, PA 19482

EXAMINER

HOSSAIN, FARZANA E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2623

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/806,651

Applicant(s)

UENAKA ET AL.

Examiner

Farzana E. Hossain

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 April 2006.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,7,8,10,12,13,15,16,18 and 24-26 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,7,8,10,12,13,15,16,18 and 24-26 is/are rejected.  
7) ☒ Claim(s) 24 is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 April 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. This office action is in responsive to communications filed on 4/27/06. Claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 12, 15, 25, 26 are amended. Claims 2, 24 are previously presented. Claims 3-6, 9, 11, 14, 17, 19-23 are cancelled. Claims 13, 16, 18 are original.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. (Rejection of claims via Niijima as base reference.)

Applicant has added the new limitations "assigning priorities to items representing contents of said EPG information, said contents including title, genre, broadcasting mode, channel, and program detail information, based on an order of the assigned priorities, selecting which of the items are to be displayed and determining in what order the items are to be displayed."

The examiner would like to point out that assigning priorities to items *representing* contents of the EPG information reads as priorities representing characteristics of a program which is described by contents such as title, channel, and detail information. Niijima reads on the limitation (Figures 5, 21, 25,

Art Unit: 2623

26). See rejection below. The word representing means to describe or to convey information.

3. Applicant's arguments, see page 8 and 9, filed 4-27-06, with respect to Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 24-26 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objection of priority and rejections of Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 24-26 using Harada and Young have been withdrawn.

Rejections below are rejections from previous action with new prior art cited.

### ***Claim Objections***

4. Claim 24 is objected to because of the following informalities: The claim depends from cancelled claim 9. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 2, 7, 10, 16 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nijima et al (US 5,926,230 and hereafter referred to "Nijima") in view

of Perlin et al (US 5,341,466 and hereafter referred to as "Perlin"), Young (US 5,949,954) and Matthews, III (US 5,815,145 and hereafter referred to as "Matthews").

Regarding Claim 1, Nijima discloses an electronic program guide (EPG) information display method (Figure 5) wherein all or some of EPG of a predetermined channel is displayed (Figure 5) on a display (Figure 3, 4), the method comprising: assigning priorities or preference degree to items or categories such as sports or movie (Column 29, lines 20-35) representing contents of the EPG information including title, genre or categories, and channel (Column 10, lines 1-21), based on an order of the assigned priorities or preference degrees, selecting which of the items are to be displayed and determine in what order the items are to be displayed (Figure 25, Figure 26). Nijima discloses in accordance with a zoom command instructing a continuous amount of zoom magnification (Figure 5), displaying on a display the EPG information of channels or time frames larger or smaller in number than channels displayed immediately before the zoom command is (Figure 5), selectively displaying, in the EPG information, the selected items in the determined order in accordance with the magnification of the zoom command (Figures 5, 21, Figures 25 and 26, Column 29, lines 25-34).

Nijima is silent on the zoom command zooms in or out the screen with respect to EPG information of the displayed situated in the center, selecting an area in which the EPG information of a program that has already been recorded is displayed; reproduction of the program corresponding to the selected area is started, and contents of the EPG information including broadcasting mode or program detail information,

displaying, on the display, currently broadcast video of a channel currently selected for display simultaneously with the EPG information.

Perlin discloses a computer system with a processor and operating system that displays data on a display area of a display unit (Figure 1, 111) and alls the system to modify the image via zooming (Figure 1). Perlin discloses the zoom command zooms in or out the screen with respect to EPG information of the displayed situated in the center or zooming to first or second level of detail (Figures 2-5). Young discloses by selecting an area in which the EPG information of a program that has already been recorded is displayed (Figure 2). Young discloses that if the "What's On Tape" feature is selected a recorded program can be selected from this directory and reproduced or played (Figure 13). It is necessarily included that if a recorded program is displayed on the EPG (Figure 3) and selection is received of an area of the EPG information that reproduction of the program corresponding to the selected area is started. Matthews discloses contents of the EPG information, the contents including title, genre, broadcasting mode or closed captioning, channel, and program detail information (Column 7, lines 43-67, Column 8, lines 1-7, 28-37). Matthews discloses displaying, on the display, currently broadcast video of a channel currently selected for display simultaneously with the EPG information (Figure 4, Column 4, lines 56-61). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Niijima to include that the zoom command zooms in or out the screen with respect to EPG information of the displayed situated in the center or zooming to first or second level of detail (Figures 2-5) as taught by Perlin in order to allow users to choose a menu of

Art Unit: 2623

options from a presentation of information depending on size (Column 1, lines 6-12, 42-50) and to show complex information even though display screen area becomes inadequate (Column 1, lines 15-19) as disclosed by Perlin. Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to modify Nijima to select an area of the EPG with recorded programs displayed and reproducing the programs (Figure 13) as taught by Young in order to allow users a convenient way to access television program listings including recorded programs (Column 1, lines 15-27) as disclosed by Young. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nijima to include that contents of the EPG information includes broadcasting mode and program detail information (Column 7, lines 43-67, Column 8, lines 1-7, 28-37) and displaying, on the display, currently broadcast video of a channel currently selected for display simultaneously with the EPG information (Figure 4, Column 4, lines 56-61) as taught by Matthews in order to improve on previous program guides which only provide inadequate program information (Column 1, lines 61-67) as disclosed by Matthews by providing the most information to a viewer of television to conveniently make the best choice for his interests.

Regarding Claim 2, Nijima, Perlin, Young and Matthews disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. Nijima discloses that EPG information is displayed and zoom magnification (Figures 5 and 21). Nijima does not teach that the program has to be on the air in order to be displayed. Young discloses that the predetermined channel and time frame are in a scope where a decision is made with reference to a channel and a

time of program to be on the air being set in display mean in order to display the EPG information (Figures 2 and 3).

Regarding Claim 7, Nijima, Perlin, Young and Matthews disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. Nijima (Figure 5, 21), Young (Figure 2), Matthews (Figure 4) disclose the EPG area of the screen. Matthews discloses that EPG information is displayed with the video (Figure 4). Perlin discloses that information is displayed on the screen and that an amount of information to be displayed is changed according to a display area for the information (Figures 2-5).

Regarding Claim 10, Nijima, Perlin, Young and Matthews disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. Nijima discloses changing size of channels displayed for new channels after zoom command (Figure 5, Figure 21). Perlin discloses zooming into the content (Figures 2-5) and that the content is zoomed into one step at a time (Figures 2-5). Nijima, Perlin, Young are silent on the zooming stepwisely changes size and a new time displayed based on EPG information. Matthews discloses that the zoom command stepwisely changes a size from the channel and the time frame displayed (Figure 6 before the zoom command is provided to new time frames displayed after the zoom command is provided (Figure 4 and Figure 6).

Regarding Claim 16, Nijima, Perlin, Young and Matthews disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. Nijima and Perlin are silent on condition information of recording. Young discloses a function to operate in conjunction with a recorder is provided (Figures 2 and 3), in an area in which EPG information of a program of which recording is associated with said recorder is displayed (Figures 2 and 3), recording condition



information for said recorder is displayed so as to be superimposed on the EPG information (Figures 2 and 3).

Regarding Claim 24, Nijima, Perlin, Young and Matthews disclose all the limitations of Claims 1, 2, 7, 10, and 16. Nijima discloses a recording medium (Figure 11B, 37) being able to be read by a computer or computer system (Figure 11B, 29) that stores a program to cause a computer to perform some of the functions of the EPG information display method.

7. Claims 8, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nijima in view of Perlin, Young and Matthews as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Davis et al (US 5,559,548 and hereafter referred to as "Davis").

Regarding Claim 8, Nijima, Perlin and Young disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. Nijima, Perlin and Young are silent on items of information displayed based on size of area. Davis discloses that items of EPG information displayed in each area in which the EPG information is to be displayed are decide based on a size of the area, the number of pixels when the area is displayed or the number of letters can be shown in the area (Figures 5b, 5c, 7b, 10A). Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Nijima in view of Perlin, Young and Matthews to include that items of information displayed in each area in which the information is to be displayed are decide based on a size of the area, the number of pixels when the area is displayed or the number of letters can be shown in the area (Figures 5b, 5c, 7b, 10A) as taught by Davis in order to present an EPG that is

more versatile, readable and aesthetically pleasing (Column 1, lines 9-16) as disclosed by Davis.

Regarding Claim 24, Nijima, Perlin, Young and Matthews disclose all the limitations of Claim 8. Nijima discloses a recording medium (Figure 11B, 37) being able to be read by a computer or computer system (Figure 11B, 29) that stores a program to cause a computer to perform some of the functions of the EPG information display method.

8. Claims 12, 13, 15, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nijima in view of Perlin, Young and Matthews as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Lemmons et al (US 5,880,768 and hereafter referred to as "Lemmons").

Regarding Claim 12, Nijima, Perlin, Young, and Matthews disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. Nijima discloses a sorting mode via a genre or theme (Figures 5). Nijima, Perlin and Young are silent on a search mode and the search criterion displayed in a different color. Lemmons discloses that an EPG operation function mode is a search mode when an area in which the EPG information of a program is displayed is selected and specified and areas of programs associated with the program are shown in different color or brightness (Figure 7 and Column 14, lines 52-64). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to modify Nijima in view of Perlin, Young and Matthews to include a search mode with EPG information is displayed and areas of the program shown in a different color (Column 13, lines 53-65) as taught by

Lemmons in order to provide a convenient EPG and allow the viewer or user to locate programs of interest (Column 1, lines 5-17).

Regarding Claim 13, Nijima, Perlin, Young, Matthews, and Lemmons disclose all the limitations of Claim 12. Nijima discloses a sorting mode via a genre or theme (Figure 5). Nijima, Perlin and Young are silent on a search mode and the search criterion displayed in a different color. Lemmons discloses that under a condition where the EPG operation function mode is the search mode (Figure 3, 116), a cursor for selecting and specifying an area corresponding to a search result selectively moves among parts of the areas in which EPG information is displayed which area are shown in the different color or highlighted (Column 13, lines 53-65).

Regarding Claim 15, Perlin, Young, and Matthews discloses all the limitations of Claim 1. Nijima, Perlin and Young are silent on the display of search results. Lemmons displays a search mode where EPG information is displayed in a manner of search results, where only programs of the channels fulfilling the search criterion are displayed (Figure 7). Lemmons displays the programs in a fashion where the channels are in alphabetical order (i.e. HBO, Max, REQ, SHO) (Figure 7). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to modify Lemmons to display the results in a manner where they display the channel axis or so as to be close to one another in a direction of a channel axis in order to provide a different viewing of the search results. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to modify Nijima in view of Perlin, Young and Matthews to include a search mode to display the search results in

a close manner (Figure 7) as taught by Lemmons in order to provide a convenient EPG and allow the viewer or user to locate programs of interest (Column 1, lines 5-17).

Regarding Claim 24, Nijima, Perlin, Young, Matthews and Lemmons discloses all the limitations of Claim 12 or 15. Nijima discloses a recording medium (Figure 11B, 37) being able to be read by a computer or computer system (Figure 11B, 29) that stores a program to cause a computer to perform some of the functions of the EPG information display method.

9. Claims 12, 13, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nijima in view of Perlin, Young and Matthews as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Legall et al (US 6,005,565 and hereafter referred to as "Legall").

Regarding Claim 12, Nijima, Perlin, Young, and Matthews disclose all the limitations of Claim 1. Young discloses a sorting mode via a genre or theme search (Figures 15-17). Nijima, Perlin and Young are silent on a search mode and the search criterion displayed in a different color. Legall discloses that an EPG operation function mode is a search mode when an area in which the EPG information of a program is displayed is selected and specified and areas of programs associated with the program are shown in different color or brightness (Column 4, lines 49-53, Column 5, lines 1-21). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to modify Nijima in view of Perlin, Young and Matthews to include a search mode with EPG information is displayed and areas of the program shown in a different color (Column 4, lines 49-53)

as taught by Legall in order to provide a convenient EPG and allow the viewer or user to locate programs of interest (Column 1, lines 5-17) as disclosed by Legall.

Regarding Claim 13, Niijima, Perlin, Young, Matthews and Legall disclose all the limitations of Claim 12. Young discloses a sorting mode via a genre or theme search (Figures 15-17). Niijima, Perlin and Young are silent on a search mode and the search criterion displayed in a different color. Legall discloses that under a condition where the EPG operation function mode is the search mode (Figures 2, 3A, 3B), a cursor for selecting and specifying an area corresponding to a search result selectively moves among parts of the areas in which EPG information is displayed which area are shown in the different color or highlighted (Column 4, lines 49-65).

Regarding Claim 24, Niijima, Perlin, Young, Matthews and Legall disclose all the limitations of Claim 12. Niijima discloses a recording medium (Figure 11B, 37) being able to be read by a computer or computer system (Figure 11B, 29) that stores a program to cause a computer to perform some of the functions of the EPG information display method.

10. Claims 18 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niijima in view of Perlin, Young and Matthews as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Schein et al (US 6,133,909 and hereafter referred to as "Schein").

Regarding Claim 18, Niijima, Perlin, Young, and Matthews disclose all the limitations of Claim 16. Niijima and Perlin are silent on condition information of recording. Young discloses that the condition information for the recording is underway

(Figures 2 and 3), that the recording is finished (Figure 2 and 3) and that the programming of timer recording is finished (Figures 2 and 3). Young discloses that the recorder can be a VCR or other recording device. Young does not disclose multiple recording devices or that condition information for the recorder is information representing a type of the recorder. Schein discloses that multiple recorders may exist whether digital or analog (Column 3, lines 36-43). Schein discloses that the user can choose which select the recording device (Column 5, lines 1-3). It is necessarily that condition information for the recorder is information representing a type of the recorder. Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to modify Nijima in view of Perlin, Young and Matthews to include multiple recorders to select the type of recorder (Column 3, lines 36-43 and Column 5, lines 1-3) as taught by Schein in order to allow automatic unattended recording of one or more programs (Column 4, lines 63-67) as disclosed by Schein.

Regarding Claim 24, Nijima, Perlin, Young, Matthews and Schein discloses all the limitations of Claim 18. Nijima discloses a recording medium (Figure 11B, 37) being able to be read by a computer or computer system (Figure 11B, 29) that stores a program to cause a computer to perform some of the functions of the EPG information display method.

11. Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nijima in view of Oosterhout et al (US 6,405,371 and hereafter referred to as "Oosterhout") and Matthews.

Regarding Claim 25, Nijima discloses displaying an EPG on a display comprising the steps of: storing EPG data in a plurality of program information cells, the EPG data including video image data (Figures 5, 7, 20, 25, 26) with a predetermined number of cells for EPG display (Column 19, lines 58-66), simultaneously displaying on the EPG video image data stored for each cell (Figures 5, 7, 20, 25, 26). Nijima discloses assigning priorities or preference degree to items or categories such as sports or movie (Column 29, lines 20-35) representing contents of the EPG information including title, genre or categories, and channel (Column 10, lines 1-21), based on an order of the assigned priorities or preference degrees, selecting which of the items are to be displayed and determining in what order the items are to be displayed (Figure 25, Figure 26). Nijima discloses zooming on the EPG (Figure 5). Nijima discloses displaying video information and items selected such as movies, sports or news (Column 10, lines 1-21, Figures 25, 26). Nijima is silent on that selecting the first predetermined number of cells or reducing the video image data simultaneous displayed by selecting a third predetermined number of cells on the EPG, the third number being of greater magnitude and displaying the video image data for the cells, and contents of the EPG information including broadcasting mode or program detail information, displaying, on the display, currently broadcast video of a channel currently selected for display simultaneously with the EPG information. Matthews discloses

contents of the EPG information, the contents including title, genre, broadcasting mode or closed captioning, channel, and program detail information (Column 7, lines 43-67, Column 8, lines 1-7, 28-37). Matthews discloses displaying, on the display, currently broadcast video of a channel currently selected for display simultaneously with the EPG information (Figure 4, Column 4, lines 56-61). Oosterhout discloses selecting a first predetermined number of cells (Figure 4, Column 5, lines 9-14) for EPG display, selecting to reduce the EPG information by selecting a third predetermined number of cells to display (Figures 4, 8).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nijima to include that contents of the EPG information includes broadcasting mode and program detail information (Column 7, lines 43-67, Column 8, lines 1-7, 28-37) and displaying, on the display, currently broadcast video of a channel currently selected for display simultaneously with the EPG information (Figure 4, Column 4, lines 56-61) as taught by Matthews in order to improve on previous program guides which only provide inadequate program information (Column 1, lines 61-67) as disclosed by Matthews by providing the most information to a viewer of television to conveniently make the best choice for his interests. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to modify Nijima for selecting a first predetermined number of cells (Figure 4, Column 5, lines 9-14) for EPG display, selecting to reduce the EPG information by selecting a third predetermined number of cells to display (Figures 4, 8) as taught by Oosterhout in order to provide enhance the convenience of the EPG (Column 1, lines 31-34) as disclosed by Oosterhout.



Regarding Claim 26, Nijima, Matthews and Oosterhout disclose all the limitations of Claim 25. Nijima discloses storing broadcasting channel number and broadcasting time for each of the plurality of cells (Column 11, lines 18-23). Nijima discloses storing video image data for each cell including currently broadcasting video corresponding to a channel and the current time (Column 9, lines 47-55, Figure 4, Column 14, lines 66-67). Matthews discloses storing the video image data stored in each cell includes a video highlight for a channel corresponding to the broadcasting channel number and broadcasting time stored in the each cell (Column 7, lines 43-67, Column 8, lines 1-7, 28-37). Oosterhout discloses selecting the first predetermined number of cells (Figures 4, 8), each having a similar broadcasting time and arranged in a tunable sequence of broadcasting channel numbers (Column 2, lines 37-45, Figure 7).

### ***Conclusion***

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2623

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Farzana E. Hossain whose telephone number is 571-272-5943. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Grant can be reached on 571-272-7294. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

FEH  
May 31, 2006

  
CHRIS KELLEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600